

REMARKS

**Status of Claims**

Claims 1-17 are present for examination. Claims 1-8 and 12 are allowed. Claims 9-11 and 13-17 stand rejected.

**Prior Art Rejection**

Claims 9-11 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Bowers and Takagi in view of and Constien. All rejected claims depend from independent claim 9.

The examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner utilizes the basic combination of Bowers and Takagi and combines the teachings of Constien for teaching the coupling of an input device to a handset of the portable telephone apparatus. Apparently, the examiner considers that "the laptop computer of Bowers can take the form of the device of Constien."

Following the examiner's logic for the sake of argument, one would presumably utilize the removable mouse of Bowers in the multifunction device of Constien. Following Bowers teaching, the mouse would be used to control the cursor position of the computer display, that is the display shown in Constien Fig. 2 as element 13. Note that this computer display 13 of Fig. 2 is separate and distinct from the telephone display 4 of Constien Fig. 1. Thus, even applying the reasoning of the examiner, at best one would have obtained a result that a removable input device of Constien controls the computer display 13 of Constien, not the telephone display 4.

Applicant has amended claim 9 to recite a keypad for entering telephone numbers and has further limited the recitation of the display to be "for displaying entered telephone numbers." Other limitations of the claim already recite that the input device controls the position of the cursor on the display – that is the display used for displaying the entered telephone numbers. With these limitations, applicant is making it clear that it is the telephone display that is being used for displaying the cursor, not some other display associated with a non-existent computer display (of Constien).

The three references applied by the Examiner in rejecting claim 9, do not make obvious applicant's invention. While utilizing a removable pointing device is indeed illustrated in Bowers, there is no teaching that a removable pointing device for operation of a cursor would, in fact, even be useful for the telephone apparatus of Constien. Certainly Constien provides no hint or suggestion that one would desire a removable pointing device and, *a fortiori*, a removable pointing device for controlling the portable telephone. The teachings of the references themselves do not provide any motivation to combine these references in a manner suggested by the Examiner to arrive at applicant's claims. As such, the Patent and Trademark Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 USC §103.

Applicant's rejected dependent claims are deemed to be patentable since they depend from amended claim 9 which, as indicated above, is patentable over the prior art. Moreover, dependent claim 10 contains the same limitation as in the last paragraph of claim 1 which the examiner stressed in his reasons for allowance of claim 1. Thus, it is submitted that claim 10 is certainly patentable over the prior art.

In view of the arguments set forth above and the amendments made hereto, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

6-8-04

By

David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER

Customer Number: 22428

Telephone: (202) 672-5407

Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 26,257